

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

PRAKASH NARAYAN,

Plaintiff,

v.

BROWN, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:21-cv-02385-DAD-JDP

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS AND DISMISSING  
THIS ACTION

(Doc. No. 8)

Plaintiff Prakash Narayan, proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, initiated this civil action on December 21, 2021. (Doc. No. 1.) This matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On March 28, 2023, the assigned magistrate judge screened plaintiff's complaint and issued findings and recommendations recommending that this action be dismissed, without leave to amend, because plaintiff failed to state a cognizable claim and this court does not have jurisdiction over plaintiff's claims. (Doc. No. 8 at 3–5.) Specifically, the magistrate judge explained that under the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine, this court does not have jurisdiction to review state court decisions, and in this action, “plaintiff seeks to challenge the fairness of judicial proceedings and rulings—both by trial and appellate courts—occurring in a civil state court action” initiated by plaintiff in Sacramento County Superior Court. (*Id.* at 4) (citing *D.C. Court of Appeals v. Feldman*, 460 U.S. 462, 483 n.16 (1983)). Those pending findings and

1 recommendations were served on plaintiff and contained notice that any objections thereto were  
2 to be filed within fourteen (14) days after service. (*Id.* at 5.) To date, no objections to the  
3 pending findings and recommendations have been filed, and the time in which to do so has now  
4 passed.

5 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this court has conducted a  
6 *de novo* review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the court concludes that the  
7 findings and recommendations are supported by the record and by proper analysis.

8 Accordingly,

- 9 1. The findings and recommendations issued on March 28, 2023 (Doc. No. 8) are  
10 adopted in full;
- 11 2. This action is dismissed due to plaintiff's failure to state a cognizable claim and  
12 due to this court's lack of jurisdiction over plaintiff's claims; and
- 13 3. The Clerk of the Court is directed to close this case.

14 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15 Dated: June 15, 2023

16   
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE